

(b)(3):10 USC 424;(b)(6)

From: Michael Richter
Sent: Sunday, April 06, 2014 10:35 AM
To: (b)(3):10 USC 424;(b)(6)
Cc:
Subject: Re: MATERIALS RECEIVED-- Pre Publication Review Request from Mike Richter (14-030)

(b)(3):10 USC 424;(b)(6)

Hi [redacted]: I wanted to raise five things.

1. My appeal letter failed to include another independent basis to reverse the Decision. The sole basis for the Decision according to your email was that the paragraph I was ordered to delete contained information that was inappropriate for public disclosure. That basis is inadequate and nonsensical because the material at issue is already in the public -- it was published by the NY Times and is available on the internet. Please forward this additional reason for reversing the Decision to the appropriate action officer so that the DoD and IC have a full opportunity to consider all of my reasons for reversing the Decision. Please note that the capitalized terms in this email have the same meaning as the manner in which those terms were defined in my appeal letter.
2. My shortened article that you approved for public release has been selected for publication by "Proceedings," the flagship publication of the US Naval Institute. Of course, due to the Decision, I was forced to delete what I feel was a very important paragraph. Therefore, the Decision has had a significant negative impact/harm on me.
3. The assigned action officer you mentioned in your prior email has not contacted me.
4. I will be in DC next Monday. To the extent a meeting is useful, I can make myself available (but I will be with my 5 year old daughter).
5. I have been tentatively retained by Screen Gems, a division of Sony Entertainment, to consult on a movie. If you have any documents/material/memoranda/policies/advice/etc that could guide me in ensuring that I fully and faithfully honor all of my obligations under my secrecy agreement, I would appreciate having the benefit of such materials.

Thanks, Mike Richter

On Wed, Mar 19, 2014 at 6:04 PM, Michael Richter [redacted] wrote:

(b)(3):10 USC 424;(b)(6)

Thank you [redacted]. I will only contact the Security POC in the event my appeal is denied, so no need to provide that information right now. Best, Mike

On Wed, Mar 19, 2014 at 5:15 PM, [redacted] wrote:

Good Afternoon Mike,

I have received both the revised article and your submission for appeal. First, the revised article is approved for publication. As required, it reflects no substantive additions or changes in content beyond that originally directed.

Secondly, DIA Prepublication Review will redirect your appeal request to DoD's Office of Prepublication and Security Review (DOPSR). Your assigned action officer there will address the turnaround time concerning your appeal. As was the case with your original submission, because multiple organizations have equities represented in your article, the appeal must also be coordinated beyond DoD.

Finally, I must refer you to a Security POC for assistance to acquire a copy of your Non-Disclosure Agreement. I hope to have contact information available for you tomorrow.

Please contact me if you have questions.

Regards,

[Redacted]
Prepublication Review
Office of Corporate Communications
Defense Intelligence Agency

(b)(3):10 USC
424;(b)(6)

(b)(3):10 USC 424;(b)(6)

-----Original Message

From: Michael Richter

Sent: Monday, March 17, 2014 10:45 AM

To:

Cc:

Subject: Re: Appeal Suspense provided.-- Pre Publication Review Request from Mike Richter (14-030)

Hi

(b)(3):10 USC 424;(b)(6)

Please find attached my appeal (the pdf) and please let me know when I can expect a decision on my appeal.

Please also find attached a much-shortened version of the article that removes the allegedly offending information and which I hope to publish in the meantime. I hope you can quickly provide clearance for this short document.

I would appreciate it much if you could confirm receipt of these two documents.

Thanks, Mike